

REMARKS

The above-identified patent application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's Action dated May 17, 2007 ("the Office Action"), a petition for a three-months' extension of time being transmitted herewith. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 11 – 16 under 35 U.S.C. §101 and 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph; rejected claims 1 – 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite; and rejected Claims 1 – 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Number 5,924,030 to Rautiola and over U.S. Patent Number 6,853,851 to Niemi. The Examiner also objected to FIG. 1 and declared that the listing of references on page 22 of the specification was not a proper information disclosure statement. In response, Applicants make the above amendments and the following remarks.

For purposes of clarity, and without intending to abandon or to dedicate to the public any patentable subject matter, Claims 11 – 16 are hereby cancelled and Claims 1 – 10 are hereby amended. Therefore, **Claims 1 – 10 are currently pending**. As set forth more fully below, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

The term "PRIOR ART" is added to Figure 1, as required.

Claims 11 – 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 and 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 11 – 16 are hereinabove cancelled. Thus, this rejection is now moot.

Claims 1 – 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for a number of informalities, lack of antecedent bases, *etc.* By this amendment, Claims 1 – 10 are extensively amended to alleviate the informalities, lack of antecedent bases, *etc.*, and to bring the claims into conformity with practice. Claims 11 – 16 are hereby cancelled. It is believed that Claims 1 – 10 now meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claim 1 – 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Number 5,924,030 to Rautiola *et al.* (herein “*Rautiola*”) and Patent Number 6,853,851 to “Niemi.” It is assumed for the purposes of this response that the Examiner is referring to US Patent Number 6,853,851 B1 to Rautiola *et al.*, wherein Niemi is the last named inventor. US Patent Number 6,853,851 B1 is referred to herein as “*Niemi*” for consistency with the Office Action. Further, it is believed that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is over *Rautiola* in view of *Niemi*, instead of both *Rautiola* and *Niemi*, as is implied by the Examiner’s statement in paragraph 6 of the Office Action. If either of these two assumptions is incorrect, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw this rejection and more specifically state what is being rejected.

Claims 11 – 16 are hereby cancelled; therefore this rejection as to those claims is moot.

Rautiola describes a wireless network 15 connected to a micro or nano network 16 at a PSTN or ISDN switch 1. *Rautiola* describes a call forwarding scheme that, when the mobile station 9 is signed off of the wireless network 15 a call to mobile station 9 is forwarded to micro network 16 using another ISDN number. In contrast, Applicant’s claim 1 recites “an extended Mobile Services Switching Center... configured to connect to said packet switching network over a gateway...” In *Rautiola*, there is no such direct connection between MSC 5 and gateway 10 over a packet network. *Rautiola*’s MSC 5 is connected to a PSTN switch first, and then to the gateway. The ISDN number is required to route the call through PSTN or ISDN switch 1.

Further, Applicant’s invention is not a call forwarding system as is *Rautiola*. In accordance with Applicant’s claim 1, when the MS is detached from the mobile telecommunications system, the second communication terminal is registered in the HLR. To Applicant’s extended Mobile Services Switching Center, the second communication terminal is treated as if it were the mobile station. *Niemi* does not teach or suggest such direct substitution, either. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant’s claim 1 distinguishes over the art of record.

Application No. 10/643,928

Atty. Docket No. 116903

November 16, 2007

Page 10 of 10

Claims 2 – 10 depend from allowable claim 1, and are likewise allowable.

The application now appearing to be in form for allowance, early notification of same is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if doing so would expedite the resolution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael B. Johannesen/

Michael B. Johannesen, Reg. No. 35,557

Intrado

1601 Dry Creek Drive

Longmont, Colorado 80503

Telephone: (630) 430-1502

Date: November 16, 2007